



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,044	10/20/2000	Yoshihiro Okada	49941(868)	8505
21874	7590	10/29/2003		
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 9169 BOSTON, MA 02209			EXAMINER PIZIALI, JEFFREY J	
			ART UNIT 2673	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 10/29/2003	

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/693,044

Applicant(s)

OKADA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeff Piziali

Art Unit

2673

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.


Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5,7,8,10-13,19 and 20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 3,6,9 and 14-18.

8. ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 12 September 2003 is a) ☒ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____


BIPIN SHALWALA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
J.P.
12/25/03

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The proposed amendment filed 12 September 2003 (Paper No. 12), if entered, would newly add the limitation, "a supplementary capacitance drive circuit for driving the supplementary capacitance lines so that a predetermined potential difference between the voltage applied to the counter electrode and the voltage applied to the pixel electrodes is always maintained when any of the pixel electrodes and supplementary capacitances leaks" to independent claim 1; the limitation, "a potential difference not less than a threshold voltage of the liquid crystal is maintained between the pixel electrodes and the counter electrode" to dependent claim 2; the limitation, "supplementary capacitance lines are separated from every scanning electrode line" to dependent claims 4 & 5; the limitation, "a potential difference not less than a threshold voltage of the liquid crystal is always maintained between the counter electrode and the pixel electrodes when any of the pixel electrodes and supplementary capacitances leaks" to independent claim 11; the limitation, "separating the supplementary capacitance lines from every scanning electrode line" to dependent claim 12; the limitation, "a predetermined potential difference between the pixel elements and the counter electrode is always maintained" to independent claim 19; as well as the limitation, "a supplemental drive circuit including a reference input maintained at the same potential as that of the common electrode for driving the supplemental capacitance lines so that a predetermined potential difference between the voltage applied to the counter electrode and the voltages applied to the pixel electrodes is always maintained when any of the pixel electrodes and supplemental capacitances leaks" to independent claim 20.

Such limitations, if incorporated into claim language, would dramatically alter the scope of the present invention, requiring additional search and consideration. By such reasoning, nonentry of the proposed amendment is deemed proper and necessary at this time.